



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/624,445	07/24/2000	Stephen Uhler	P5297/RSH	5723

32615 7590 10/08/2003

ROSENTHAL & OSHA L.L.P. / SUN  
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800  
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER
----------

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

//

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/624,445

Applicant(s)

UHLER ET AL.

Examiner

Charles E Anya

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-9,11 and 13-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-9,11 and 13-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,144,990 to Brandt et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,529,936 B1 to Mayo et al.**

As to claim 20, Brandt teaches a Device (Computer System 340/FlowMark 450 Col. 13 Ln. 28 – 47), an HTTP Request (“URL...” Col. 12 Ln. 51 – 67, Col. 16 Ln. 1 – 3), a Requester (Web Browser 212 Col. 12 Ln. 51 – 67), extracting request in from the HTTP request (Col. 12 Ln. 66 – 67, Col. 13 Ln. 1 – 8), Command (“command...” Col. 13 Ln. 1 – 53), a Handler Object (FMIG 430 Col. 13 Ln. 14 – 22), invoking the commands on the device (Col. 13 Ln. 34 – 43), receiving device information from the device (“receive...” Col. 13 Ln. 43 – 47) and returning device information to the requester (Col. 14 Ln. 10 – 32).

Brandt is silent with reference to using information from a properties object.

Mayo teaches using information from a properties object (“...http://...” Col. 7 Ln. 61 – 67, Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 18). It would have obvious to apply the teaching of Mayo to the

system of Brandt. One would have been motivated to make such a modification in order to send a request and return a result to a requester (Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 18).

**Claims 1 – 3, 6 – 9, 11, 13 – 19 and 21 – 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,233,622 to Atsatt et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,529,936 B1 to Mayo et al.**

As to claim 1, Atsatt teaches an extensible application web framework (“extension...” Col. 2 Ln. 37 – 51), a Server Object (Web Demon 20 Col. 3 Ln. 1 – 67, Adapter 22 Col. 3 Ln. 11 – 54), a Web Application (Server 16 Col. 3 Ln. 1 – 67), a Request Object (Request Object 26 Col. 4 Ln. 28 – 67), at least one or more handler objects (Handler 24 (24a, 24b, 24c) Col. 3 Ln. 19 – 67, Col. 4 Ln. 1 – 67).

Atsatt is silent with reference to a properties object.

Mayo teaches a Properties Object (Objects 32 – 32n, Object 50 Col. 7 Ln. 20 – 67, Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 67, Properties 84 – 86 Col. 9 Ln. 1 – 13, “...argument-name...argument-value...” Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 55). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Mayo to the system of Atsatt. One would have been motivated to make such modification to provide a unit of distribution for the objects (Col. 7 Ln. 61 – 67).

As to claim 2, Although an initialization method and a handler name is not explicitly taught these limitations are inherent because in order for the handler object to process a request resources (e.g. memory), it must have to be allocated to the handler object and the handler object inherently has an identifier otherwise it would be impossible for the adapter object to pass the request object to the handler object.

As to claim 3, Atsatt teaches the step of the handler object creating/instantiating additional/second handler object (Handler 24 Col. 4 Ln. 1 – 9, IRemoteHandler Col. 10 Ln. 1 – 9).

As to claim 6, Atsatt is silent reference to altering the properties object. Mayo teaches altering the properties object (Col. 9 Ln. 11 – 13). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Mayo to the system of Atsatt. One would have been motivated to make such modification to promote code reuse (Col. 9 Ln. 11 – 13).

As to claim 7, Atsatt teaches the step of creating a server object (Col. 9 Ln. 16 – 25), the step of creating a handler object (Col. 4 Ln. 12 – 17, Block 36 Col. 5 Ln. 1 – 7), receiving an indication of a request (Col. 3 Ln. 37 – 47), creating a request object in response to receiving the indication (Col. 4 Ln. 31 – 35: NOTE: Atsatt does not explicitly show the step of creating a request object in response to receiving the indication however this is inherent because the adapter receives the input data before the creation of a request object), a response method (Block 46 Col. 5 Ln. 37 – 41) and the step of calling methods of the request object to obtain the request at the port (Col. 4 Ln. 46 – 50: NOTE: A port is inherent because the URLs includes port number that a web server is running on). And see the rejection of claim 1.

As to claim 8, see the rejection of claim 3.

As to claim 9, claim 7 meets claim 9 except for the step of waiting for a request for aggregated content. Atsatt is silent with reference to this limitation, however, Atsatt teaches IRemoteHandler that could forward requests to a second handler object (Col. 10 Ln. 1 – 9). By some

doing the handler object would be chained and as the response is returned along the chain an aggregate content would be accumulated.

As to claims 11 and 13, see the rejection of claims 3 and 9.

As to claim 14, see the rejection of claim 1.

As to claim 15, Atsatt teaches the step where a handler object is called to respond to a request embodied in the request object (Col. 4 Ln. 42 – 50).

As to claim 16, claims 3 and 9 meets claim 16 except for the step of exchanging information via the properties object. For this limitation see the rejection of claims 3 and 9.

As to claim 17, see the rejection of claim 1.

As to claim 18, see the rejection of claims 3 and 9.

As to claim 19, claim 6 meets claim 19 except for responding to requests based on the properties object.

Mayo teaches the step of responding to requests based on the properties object ("property-name..." Col. 8 Ln. 7 – 18). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Mayo to the system of Atsatt. One would have been motivated to make such modification to determine the interface to a function that a request would be routed to (Col. 8 Ln. 7 – 18).

As to claim 21, Atsatt teaches the request object being configured to obtain and parse the request (Request Object 26 Col. 4 Ln. 10 – 67).

As to claim 22, see the rejection of claim 3.

As to claim 23, Atsatt teaches the request object that includes information related to the request (Request Object Col. 4 Ln. 31 – 40).

As to claim 24, see the rejection of claim 6.

As to claim 25, see the rejection of claim 1.

As to claim 26, Atsatt teaches formulating a response to the request (...response..." Col. 3 Ln. 54 – 65, Reply Object 28 Col. 4 Ln. 11 – 50).

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. Applicant's arguments filed 7/10/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. (Referring to claims 1 – 19 and 21 – 26).

Applicant argues that the Mayo prior art reference provides properties object that includes interfaces but does not include name-value pair. The Examiner disagrees. The URL addresses of the property object include name-value pair (Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 55) thus negating Applicant's argument. This implies that Mayo not only provides properties object that include interfaces as the Applicant agrees but also name-value pair.

### ***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E Anya whose telephone number is (703) 305-3411. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:30) First Friday off.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



**JOHN FOLLANSBEE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**

Charles E Anya  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2126